

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

MIGUEL ANGEL PINA BARRIENTOS,	)	
AIS #245143,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO. 2:08-CV-0009-WKW
	)	
ARNOLD HOLT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the court is a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for habeas corpus relief filed by Miguel Angel Pina Barrientos [“Barrientos”], a state inmate, on December 20, 2007.<sup>1</sup> In this petition, Barrientos challenges a controlled substance conviction imposed upon him by the Circuit Court of Mobile County, Alabama.

**DISCUSSION**

This court “in the exercise of its discretion and in furtherance of justice” may transfer an application for writ of habeas corpus to “the district court for the district within which the State court was held which convicted” the petitioner. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). Barrientos attacks a conviction entered against him by the Circuit Court of Mobile County, Alabama. Mobile County is located within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama. In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that a transfer of this case to such other court for review and disposition is appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the Clerk of this court stamped the present petition “filed” on January 3, 2008, Barrientos certified execution of documents attached to the petition on December 20, 2007. The law is well settled that a pro se inmate’s petition is deemed filed the date it is delivered to prison officials for mailing. *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 271-272 (1988); *Adams v. United States*, 173 F.3d 1339, 1340-41 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); *Garvey v. Vaughn*, 993 F.2d 776, 780 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993). In light of the foregoing and for purposes of this Recommendation, the court considers December 20, 2007 as the date of filing.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

It is further

ORDERED that on or before January 31, 2008 the parties may file objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which the party is objecting. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar the party from a de novo determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981, *en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008.

/s/Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE